DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 825 HE 023 759

AUTHOR Armour, Robert; And Others
TITLE Racial and Gender Differences in Faculty Careers.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990). For a related document, see HE 023 919.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Minority Groups; National Surveys; *Sex Differences; *Teacher Attitudes; *Tenured Faculty

ABSTRACT

The overall study examined job satisfaction among tenured college faculty. This paper compares responses from minority (about 6%) and female (about 18%) faculty with the overall responses (N=1135). Overall, 91% reported being satisfied with their careers with 82% saying they would choose the career again. Race and gender were not related significantly to overall satisfaction. Minority faculty tended to have been at their institutions less time than white colleagues but were more likely to have decided to become a professor out of a desire to help others. In all, minorities gave significantly different responses to 26 of the 132 comparisons. Female faculty gave significantly different responses to 65 (49%) of the responses. Among the many differences found between men and women respondents were that: women had spent less time at their institution, less time in rank, and less time in tenured positions. They tended to be at the lower ranks and to concentrate in the professional disciplines rather than the natural sciences. Women also had spent a higher percentage of their time teaching and less doing research and rated themselves as better teachers and worse researchers. Women were more dissatisfied with their physical working conditions, advancement, job security, and the teaching load. Contains 19 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Racial and Gender Differences in Faculty Careers

by R. Armour, B. Fuhrmann, and J. Wergin

Virginia Commonwealth University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED323825

A Paper Presented at

The American Educational Research Association

April, 1990

OBJECTIVES The purpose of this project was to study job satisfaction among senior college faculty. Specifically, senior faculty were surveyed to study their personal and career development and job satisfaction. Overall results were presented at AERA in 1989 (Armour and others, 1989). For this 1990 paper, responses from minority and female faculty are compared with the overall responses to demonstrate racial and gender differences in satisfaction.

FRAMEWORK FOR STUDY[1] Faculty morale and satisfaction have been the subject of considerable study in the past several years. An early study at the Carnegie Foundation (1985) as well as Bowen and Schuster's well-publicized study (1986) showed college and university faculty to be dissatisfied with their careers and began something of a national controversy. Others (Eble and

---

[1] A fuller framework for the study and methodological statement can be found in our 1989 AERA paper on this project, along with findings relating to disciplinary differences in satisfaction.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Armour
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 023 759

McKeachie, 1985; Sorcinelli, 1985; Blackburn and Lawrence, 1986; Austin and Rice, 1987) demonstrated more positive attitudes among faculty in their studies. We have attempted to demonstrate in our own work something of the satisfaction of faculty as it relates to personal and career development. In particular, for this study, we have placed responses from minorities and women into this context. We will show ways in which minority and female responses are both similar to and dissimilar from their white and male counterparts. Since minorities and women traditionally have not often had mainstream positions in higher education, this study becomes an important effort to understand the dynamics of their experiences in colleges and universities.

METHODS In the spring of 1988 we distributed a 20 page questionnaire to 1564 senior faculty at six institutions in central Virginia. The colleges represented the range of higher education institutions: a community college, a liberal arts college, a traditionally black university, two small universities, and a large research university. This is an unusual mix of institutions for surveys of this sort and allows us to present a full range of attitudes. "Senior faculty" was defined as all faculty with tenure holding the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor. Of all surveys sent out 1135 were returned, for a response rate of 74%.

For this particular study, first all minority respondents were compared to their white colleagues. Because of the small

numbers involved in any one group, we collapsed blacks, Asians, and Native Americans into a single group of minority faculty which made up about 6% of the population. Then female respondents (about 18% of the population) were compared with their male colleagues. Significant differences among categories are at the .05 level or better (chi-square or 2-tail t-test, as appropriate).

RESULTS Overall, we found satisfaction high among senior faculty. Approximately 91% reported being at least somewhat satisfied with their careers. Eighty-two percent would probably choose the career again. Race and gender were not related significantly to overall satisfaction: Minorities and women were about as well satisfied on this one item as their colleagues. On other items, however, minorities and women gave quite different responses. These results were not confounded by institutional setting. For example, we included a traditionally black university in the survey, and we hypothesized that its faculty would skew any figures for minority faculty. This turned out not to be the case since that university had a low number of tenured faculty. In fact, the research university surveyed had three times as many minority faculty as did the black institution, and the community college had almost the same number of minority faculty.

Minorities [All comparisons are of minority faculty with their white colleagues.] Minority faculty have been at their

institutions significantly less time than their white colleagues. They reported spending less time in their role as faculty each week, yet they divided up their activities about the same as do white colleagues, as table 1 indicates:

TABLE 1

	Minority Faculty	White Faculty
hours/week in faculty role	42	50*[2]
% of time teaching	46	45
% of time in service	27	24
% of time in research	17	21
% of time in other scholarship	8	9

They were more likely to decide to become a professor out of a desire to help others. They believed that their institutions value teaching and service more highly and research less highly. They personally ranked service and research higher to themselves:

TABLE 2

(items rated on a 5-point scale, with 5 being "most important")

	Minority Faculty	White Faculty
importance to inst.-teaching	4.4	4.0*
importance to you--teaching	4.7	4.6
importance to inst.--service	3.9	3.3*
importance to you--service	3.7	3.4*
importance to inst.--research	3.7	4.2*
importance to you--research	4.2	3.8*

The surprising factor in this table is in the research category. White faculty believed their institutions value research more

---

2. All items in tables with an * have a level of significance of .05 or lower. Please see the appendix for a listing of all t-values, X^2, and probabilities

highly than do minority faculty, yet minority faculty reported that they value research personally more than white colleagues do.

Minority faculty were twice as likely to be making plans to leave their current institution, and they were more likely to believe they have good chances of moving to a different career. They were more inclined to believe they work harder than others in their discipline. They were less satisfied with the quality of their higher administration and more satisfied with their students. They were less satisfied in seeing the results of their work, but they agreed that they are thinking about leaving a legacy. They found it less difficult to draw a line between work and leisure. They were more inclined to find life easy, free, and easy going. They were most inclined to find their institutional community in their institution as a whole, rather than in their department. They were almost twice as likely to be responsible for a dependent adult.

In all, minorities gave significantly different responses on 26 of 132 comparisons.[3] We did not run a stepwise multiple regression on minority faculty since the number of variables was larger than the sample, which suggests that a regression would be unreliable.

Women [All comparisons are of female faculty with their male colleagues] Of the 132 comparisons women gave significantly

---

[3] The appendix shows 138 responses, but there were several items with multiple responses. For this count in the paper we have collapsed these into a single response.

different responses on 65 items (49%). There are far too many differences between male and female faculty to cover fully in this paper, but a few items will indicate the direction of the differences.

Women had spent less time at their institution, less time in rank, and less time tenured. They tended to be at the lower ranks and to concentrate in the professional disciplines rather than the natural sciences. They had spent a higher percentage of their time teaching and less doing research:

TABLE 3

	Women	Men
hours/week in faculty role	48	50
% of time teaching	53	43*
% of time in service	24	25
% of time in research	13	22*
% of time in other scholarship	8	9

Women ranked teaching and service more important and research less important to themselves personally:

TABLE 4

(items rated on a 5-point scale, with 5 being "most important")

	Women	Men
importance to inst.-teaching	4.2	4.0*
importance to you--teaching	4.7	4.6*
importance to inst.--service	3.4	3.3
importance to you--service	3.8	3.4*
importance to inst.--research	4.2	4.2
importance to you--research	3.7	3.9*

Women were more likely to believe that their most important

accomplishment lies in teaching, rather than research or service. They rated themselves better teachers and servers and worse researchers. They were less likely to claim higher than average influence within their institution, and they were less likely to believe they have a niche at their institution. They rated their chances of moving to another career higher. They were more likely to claim they spend more time working now than when they entered the profession. They were more satisfied than male colleagues with their recognition from students--but less satisfied with--

*the use of their abilities,
*the pursuit of professional interests,
*the use of time as they see fit,
*seeing the results of their work,
*professional collaboration,
*advancement,
*physical working conditions,
*job security,
*teaching load,
*the use of their leisure time, and
*their community service.

Nevertheless, they were more likely to say their lives are worthwhile, full, rewarding, but that they are overworked and pressured.

Personally, they were more likely to find their social community from people from within their departments. Given five additional hours a week, women were more likely than men to spend

it on personal leisure, and less likely to spend it with their families. They were more likely to anticipate retiring early, to have never married, to have no children at home, and to have no responsibility for a dependent adult.

We conducted a stepwise multiple regression to compare the ability of male and female responses to predict overall satisfaction. Table 5 shows the predictor variables for the overall sample:

Table 5

Stepwise Multiple Regression: Overall Satisfaction

Variable		Cumulative R^2
1.	Satisfaction vs. expectations as graduate student	.29
2.	Recognition received from administration	.42
3.	Extent to which career is "stuck" (negative)	.49
4.	Perceived influence in department or school	.53
5.	Satisfaction with standard of living	.57
6.	Feelings of "restlessness" in career (negative)	.59
7.	Feeling "free" (vs. "tied down")	.61
8.	Interest in same specialization since tenure	.63
9.	Self-rating of performance: service	.64
10.	Commitment to work	.65
11.	Importance of other scholarly/creative activities to institution	.66
12.	Satisfaction with how time spent	.67
13.	Satisfaction with variety in work	.68
14.	Opportunities for community service	.69
15.	Importance of research activities to self	.70
16.	Recognition received from faculty outside institution	.71

Table 6 provides the stepwise multiple regression for males and table 7 for females:

Table 6
Stepwise Multiple Regression: Male Satisfaction

Variable	Cumulative R^2
1. Satisfaction vs. expectations as a graduate student	.30
2. Satisfaction with standard of living	.42
3. Feelings of restlessness (negative)	.49
4. Influence within department or school	.53
5. Feeling stuck (negative)	.56
6. Personal rating of performance in service	.58
7. Satisfaction with colleagues at institution	.59
8. Satisfaction with use of abilities	.61
9. Feeling free vs. feeling tied down	.62
10. Interest in same area as when a graduate student	.63

Table 7
Stepwise Multiple Regression: Female Satisfaction

Variable	Cumulative R^2
1. Recognition from institutional faculty	.51
2. Importance of service to self	.64
3. Chances of moving to a different institution	.73
4. Personal rating of performance in service	.78
5. Importance of teaching at the institution	.82
6. Satisfaction vs. expectations as a graduate student	.87
7. Examining life more now	.91
8. Collaboration with colleagues	.92

Satisfaction for female faculty is much more predictable than for male faculty. Eight items provide 92% predictability for females, as opposed to ten items with only 63% predictability for males. Only two items (satisfaction vs. expectations as a graduate student and personal rating of performance in service)

appear on both tables. Female items focus mostly on colleagues, students, service, and teaching--findings consistent with the significantly different responses in the raw data.

DISCUSSION

In their 1988 book on women in the academic world, Women of Academe: Outsiders in the Sacred Grove, Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington based their thesis on the assumption that women have a different view of life in this profession than do their male colleagues. Further, women in the profession were motivated by interest in those topics which most directly affect people: "What women do find meaningful...are subjects through which interior change is possible--enlargement of individual scope, shaping of individual identity, interior liberation--for themselves, and for their students" (p. 89).

Their work, founded on a series of interviews with women in the profession, is supported by numerous other studies which were quantitative. As early as 1976 scholars reported that women were less satisfied than men in teaching careers (Holton and Gemmil, 1976). In 1980 Marilyn Berman reported that women faculty were less satisfied with their jobs and found more conflict among the roles they had to play than male colleagues. The next year Grahn and others (1981) found that female faculty at a single research institution were more satisfied than male faculty with personal achievement and service, but less satisfied with advancement and security.

For at least a decade now AERA has been hearing about differences between male and female faculty in attitudes toward their careers. Fuchs and Lovano-Kerr (1981) reported that non-tenured women perceived their faculty lives differently from men. Women were less satisfied with the quantity of work, but more satisfied with their service. In 1982 these same researchers followed up their original study. In this study they revealed that male faculty were more satisfied with their research and with their colleagues' evaluation of their research. Women were more satisfied with teaching and service and believed their colleagues to rate them highly in these catagories. In 1983 at AERA Hill reported that male and female faculty showed little difference in overall satisfaction, but found that the genders had different expectations for the profession.

The large Carnegie study of 1989 (n=5,450) confirmed many of the earlier findings. Almost four out of five respondents reported that they would choose the profession again and that they did not wish they had chosen another profession, with no difference by gender. But the Carnegie study also showed important differences between genders when more specific concerns are looked at. Females were more oriented toward teaching than were males, with 78% indicating their primary interest to be in teaching, while only 67% of the males so indicated. Seventy-three percent of the women believed that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion, while only 58% of the males agreed. Sixty-nine percent of the responding males were

currently engaged in scholarly work which should lead to publication, exhibition, or recital, while only 60% of the females were similarly engaged. Although they reported approximately equal level of satisfaction overall, women were less likely than men to believe that faculty salaries have kept up with inflation (22% vs. 27%), and more likely to report that their jobs are the source of considerable personal strain (51% vs. 40%).

Finally, a report from the even larger U.S. Department of Education study (n=8,383) issued in 1990 showed similar findings: 86% of the men and 84% of the women reported that they are at least somewhat satisfied with their jobs in the academy. Yet important differences show up when comparisons are made in different aspects of the job. This research showed that women wished for more time for human related activities, such as mentoring and advising, but were more likely than men to see themselves overworked. They were more dissatisfied with the mix of teaching, research, service, and administration than were men; and they allocated their work time accordingly. Women reported spending 61% of their time teaching, while men reported spending 54%. Women reported 12% of their time spent on research, while men reported 18%.

The patterns for gender difference hold through all of these studies. Women and men report general satisfaction with their careers but find differing sources for that satisfaction. Men tend toward research, impersonal activities, and their

careers. Women tend to emphasize teaching and service and activities which bring them into contact with other people.

On the other hand, studies of minority career satisfaction are not as numerous. A search for studies tying minority or black faculty to satisfaction turned up surprisingly little data. The 1989 Carnegie data do not report racial differences. The same is true for the 1990 Department of Education study (at least as far as the preliminary report in The Chronicle of Higher Education is concerned).

Silver, Dennis, and Spikes (1988) conducted a survey of black faculty who teach in traditionally white institutions in the South. This study, as indeed do most studies dealing with blacks in the academy, focused on the under representation of blacks in colleges and universities. It did, however, touch on satisfaction in important, but minor, ways. It showed that black faculty are most satisfied with their evaluations by students and administrators. The highest levels of dissatisfaction were found in items relating to salary and the promotion and tenure system. Faculty at full professor tended to be more satisfied than those at lower ranks.

Williams-Green and others (1989) reported on a study of 396 black faculty and administrators in Virginia. Despite a rather low response rate (38%), this study also revealed interesting data on black faculty. It contained numerous items dealing with satisfaction, but few related to the issues we studied in our research. Nevertheless, Williams-Green showed that most

respondents were at least "somewhat" satisfied with their chances for personal and professional growth and for recognition. They did find relatively higher satisfaction with the promotion and tenure process at these institutions. A majority believed that their salaries are at least "somewhat" appropriate for their experiences. The study did reveal perceptions of inequality for black faculty, but there was most often disagreement among respondents on this issue.

Since these studies asked fundamentally different questions about minority satisfaction than we did, these findings do not specifically confirm ours. In general, however, they do show that black faculty are at least somewhat satisfied with their careers, although, like women faculty, they show dissatisfaction with specific situations. In this, these two studies and ours are in broad agreement. Even though these two studies are valuable, the absence of numerous others suggests that minority job satisfaction is an area in need of further research. It would be especially interesting and fruitful to study a large enough sample so that responses from different minority groups could be compared.

SIGNIFICANCE In our survey and in most other studies, both minorities and women claim that they are about as well satisfied with their careers as their colleagues, but there are major differences in the ways these groups view their careers. Our study suggests that minorities have to some extent accepted the

values of the dominating forces in higher education. Women, however, have entirely different views of their careers than do men. Not only do these differences need to be understood and appreciated, but the implications of them for institutional policy and procedures need to be addressed if institutions are serious about retaining women and minority faculty. Institutions must also recognize the potential importance of women and minority contributions to the culture of the institution.

Traditional expectations for faculty are not kind to women and minorities as groups, although some members of each group are very comfortable with current expectations. The work environment in U.S. colleges and university has been created by white males for white males.

Items from our survey relating to personal lives of faculty are particularly revealing and troublesome as far as women's attitudes toward their career are concerned. That women were more likely to spend five additional hours a week on personal leisure is suggestive of the pressures women find in the job. That they were more likely to anticipate retiring early, to have never married, to have no children at home, and to have no responsibility for a dependent adult also suggests the sacrifice of a private life for many women faculty.

The issue of physical working conditions can serve as microcosm of the entire issue. Our survey showed that women are significantly less likely than men to be satisfied with their physical working conditions. This seemed odd, and at first we

dismissed the difference by attributing it to something as simple as women being more likely than men to care about well appointed offices and classrooms, even though we had no evidence to support such a conclusion. On further consideration, however, we began to believe that this issue is an important one. Faculty offices tend to be small, and faculty are rather isolated in them. Even when faculty share offices, they often get in each other's way rather than become intimate; and the presence of other people in the room makes personal interaction with students difficult. Faculty offices are not bad for research, grading, and class preparation (although many still prefer to work at home where they can be more comfortable), but the halls, bathrooms, and the dining room are better for conversation. If women view their careers as an opportunity to work with other humans, faculty offices may be the last place they would want to work. Architects have most often been men; the office space and classrooms they design often are designed for male faculty. To enhance female satisfaction with the profession, building designers might simply have to ask them what sort of physical working conditions would suit them best.

The stepwise multiple regression for women faculty shows amazing unity among women in terms of the influences on their satisfaction. Eight items provide a predictability of 92%. Since women are as a group more homogeneous with respect to the factors influencing their career satisfaction than men, this suggests that for purposes of intervention, it is more meaningful to talk about women as a group. Since men are more disparate, it is less

likely that an individual man would be pleased with strategies suggested for the entire gender. The high predictability for women lends itself to interventions to improve female satisfaction with the profession. In essence we can either change women or we can change the environment. Slow, but steady growth of women in higher ranks and in administrative positions suggests that they will someday have the numbers and power to change the environment. The differences between sources for satisfaction for men and women seen in this and other studies point to the direction of these changes--increased emphasis on teaching and service, better working conditions, more professional collaboration, more equal opportunities for advancement for all people.

One implication of these findings and conclusions is that institutions could, if they wanted to, create environments which are more compatible with the goals and interests of women and minorities. This new environment would be one which is more collegial and more nurturing, one which rewards good teaching and service in practice as well as in theory.

SOURCES

Aisenberg, N. and Harrington, M. Women of Academe: Outsiders in the Sacred Grove. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Armour, R., Caffarella, R., Fuhrmann, B., and Wergin, J. Senior faculty careers and personal development: A survey. Paper presented at AERA, 1989.

Austin, A. and Rice, R. Community, commitment and congruence: A different kind of excellence. Washington: Council of Independent Colleges, 1987.

Berman, M. Variables associated with role conflicts between career and family. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1980.

Blackburn, R. and Lawrence, J. Aging and quality of faculty performance. Review of Educational Research, 23 (fall), 115-35, 1986.

Bowen, H. and Schuster, J. American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford, 1986.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The faculty deeply troubled. Change, 17 (Sept./Oct.): 31-4, 1985.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The condition of the professoriate: attitudes and trends, 1989. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Eble, K. and McKeachie, W. Improving undergraduate education through faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Fuchs, R. and Lovano-Kerr, J. Retention, professional development and quality of life: a comparative study of male/female non-tenured faculty. Paper presented at AERA, 1981.

Grahn, J. and others. General college job satisfaction survey, University of Minnesota. general college Studies, 16 (no. 1), 1980-81.

Hill, M. Some factors affecting the job satisfaction of academic women. Paper presented at AERA, 1983.

Hollon, C. and Gemmill, G. A comparison of female and male professors on participation in decision making, job related tension, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 80-93, 1976.

Lovano-Kerr, J. and Fuchs, R. Retention revisited: a follow-up study of female/male non-tenured faculty perceptions on retention, professional development and quality of life. Paper presented at AERA, 1982.

Silver, J, Dennis, R., and Spikes, C. Black faculty in

traditionally white institutions in selected Adams states: characteristics, experiences and perceptions. Atlanta: southern Education Foundation, 1988.

Sorcinelli, M. Faculty Careers: Personal, institutional and societal dimensions. Paper presented at AERA, 1985.

U.S. Education Department. New U.S. survey assembles a statistical portrait of the American professoriate, The Chronicle of Higher Education (Feb. 7, 1990), p. A15-6.

Williams-Green, J. and others. An analysis of the black instructional faculty and administrators satisfaction survey (preliminary results). Blacksburg, VA: the Office of Institutional Research and Planning Analysis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1989.